



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

## Edinburgh Research Explorer

### The Late-Victorian Romance Revival

**Citation for published version:**

Vaninskaya, A 2008, 'The Late-Victorian Romance Revival: A Generic Excursus', *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 57-79. [https://doi.org/10.2487/elt.51.1\(2008\)0015](https://doi.org/10.2487/elt.51.1(2008)0015)

**Digital Object Identifier (DOI):**

[10.2487/elt.51.1\(2008\)0015](https://doi.org/10.2487/elt.51.1(2008)0015)

**Link:**

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

**Published In:**

English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920

**Publisher Rights Statement:**

©Vaninskaya, A. (2008). The Late-Victorian Romance Revival: A Generic Excursus. English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920, 51(1), 57-79. 10.2487/elt.51.1(2008)0015

**General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

**Take down policy**

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact [openaccess@ed.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@ed.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



35. *A Child of the Jago*, 28.

36. *Ibid.*, 47.

37. *Ibid.*

38. Timothy Clark, "Image and Style in the Floating World: The Origins and Early Development of Ukiyo-e," in Timothy Clark, Anne Nishimura Morse, Louise E. Virgin, Allen Hockley, *The Dawn of the Floating World (1650–1765): Early Ukiyo-e Treasures from the Museum of Fine Arts Boston* (London: Royal Academy of Arts, 2001), 14.

39. *The Dawn of the Floating World (1650–1765)*, 238–39.

40. *A Child of the Jago*, 97.

41. *Ibid.*, 62.

42. *Ibid.*, 68–69.

43. The influence in Europe of *japonisme* can be traced back to the Paris Exposition of 1867.

44. G. R. Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899–1914* (1971; London and Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Ashfield Press, 1990), 57.

45. Alfred Stead, *Great Japan: A Study of National Efficiency* (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1905), 17–18.

46. *A Child of the Jago*, 80.

47. *Ibid.*, 238.

## The Late-Victorian Romance Revival: A Generic Excursus

ANNA VANINSKAYA  
University of Cambridge

ATTEMPTING TO DEFINE romance is like attempting to define genre itself: an immensely revelatory but ultimately futile exercise.<sup>1</sup> At the very least it is doomed to circularity and tautology, for it starts out already knowing what the definition is—enough, at least, to specify or to extend it. Taxonomies build on and link up with previously existing taxonomies, along a chain that disappears into the remote past of Western literary history. To abstract a set of romance characteristics from a group of texts one has to use some criteria to identify that group in the first place, and any such criteria will be a version of the very romance characteristics one is looking for. But though they may be methodologically problematic, there is no shortage of ideal formal definitions which attempt to conscript everything from medieval tales of aristocratic love and supernatural adventure to modern-day "genre fiction," and Northrop Frye's mythos of summer is only the most famous. These models can hardly do justice to the complex cultural background of an individual work, let alone a period phenomenon like the "romance revival" of the 1880s and 90s.

Derek Brewer's canonical characterisation will serve to illustrate the difficulty. Like Northrop Frye and Gillian Beer,<sup>2</sup> Brewer is interested in romance as a "mode" in continuous metamorphosis from Greek antiquity, through the medieval and early modern cycles, to Morris, MacDonald, Wells, and finally Tolkien. The romance is "a fantasy story about an individual's personal love and adventure, in which quest and conflict culminate in a happy ending. The story is told in a natural sequence with rhetorical art, local realism, and humour. The subject-matter is secular, but there are symbolic implications. Romance may be said to be the antithesis of tragedy...." It is a late-cultural form, sophisticated and aesthetically self-aware, told "by well-educated men to upper-class audiences."<sup>3</sup> But it also shares many of the formal characteristics of folktale narratives and makes extensive use of convention and rep-

etition, of the marvellous, supernatural, and improbable. Unlike the epic, the romance is concerned with the individual, though public and private are usually reconciled in the happy ending and social responsibility is restored.

Although Brewer's representative sample is mainly medieval, his definition is meant to be general enough to apply to a variety of contexts: "Romance is a mode ... and examples are found from Classical Antiquity to the present day."<sup>4</sup> Indeed, in the critical debates of the *fin de siècle* many of its elements—idealism, optimism, improbability, adventure—were commonplace. But just as many were conspicuous by their absence, or were altered beyond recognition. The target audience was assumed to be significantly lower on the social scale; the relative prominence of individual or society was fiercely contested; fantasy and humour were by no means always welcome guests. The romance itself appeared younger: the earliest (and most juvenile) of literary modes. For its detractors it was, if anything, the very opposite of its aristocratic predecessor, a mass commercial genre produced by hacks for the edification of lower-class boys. Those more charitably disposed talked of Scott and Stevenson and the literature of the youth of mankind. None of this undermines Brewer's definition in its entirety, for there is no doubt that it holds well for certain times, places, and individual texts. But neither it nor any other summation can be expected to distil the essence of more than a thousand years of literary development. A genre is not an abstract entity, but one which manifests itself in concrete works and at specific historical moments: it is, in the end, what contemporaries (and future generations) make of it, and what they make of it alters over time. When one recalls that even during a given period different interpretative communities approach the same object with very different agendas, the possibility of a unifying definition dissipates like the mirage it is.

So what made the late-Victorian romance revival a new and period-specific departure? After all, romance had been defining itself against realism ever since the rise of the novel, and so-called "romances" had been written throughout the century: by Walter Scott at its beginning, by the mid-Victorian aesthetes with their poetic treatments of Arthurian matter, by the hundreds of authors of penny dreadfuls and of utopias.<sup>5</sup> What changed in the 1880s were the economics of publishing, the material methods of book production and distribution. This had many far-reaching (and well-documented) effects, and foremost among them was the rise of the "New Romance." The triumph of the cheap one-volume

first edition, aided by modern methods of advertising, propelled the work of R. L. Stevenson and H. Rider Haggard, Marie Corelli and Hall Caine to best-seller status.<sup>6</sup> The enormous scale of their popularity was unprecedented: the immediate readership of romance was now several orders of magnitude larger than that of its Gothic precursors of a hundred years earlier (sales figures began to be numbered in millions). In the respectable literary world, romance writers were among the first to take advantage of the dramatically expanding popular fiction market. While George Gissing was still producing realist novels in the old three-decker mould (and complaining about being outsold by the likes of Haggard, Corelli, and Caine), Stevenson's progeny brought their publishers vast profits with their one-volume tales of adventure. But whether in the form of single volumes, serials, short stories in periodicals, or syndication in provincial newspapers—from which Haggard and Caine among others made a fair amount of money<sup>7</sup>—romance revivalists were as quick as daily newspaper proprietors to capitalise on the possibilities offered by the new developments in publishing.

The late-Victorian romance in this sense was not a generic entity but a commercial one, a commodity in an increasingly fragmented mass market. According to Peter Keating,<sup>8</sup> the ascendance of new formats (respectable juvenile story papers, for instance) directed at particular demographics led to an increasing specialization. This much is incontestable, but as soon as Keating leaves the more or less solid terrain of book history for the swamps of formalist analysis, problems begin to arise. As part of the process of differentiation, he argues, separate romance subgenres emerged, each with its own traditions, conventions, and independent identities. He singles out the new Gothic of Stoker, the one-volume shocker of Stevenson and Wilde, which grew out of the mid-Victorian sensation triple-decker, and the detective novel in its modern form, created on the foundations of Dickens, Collins, and Poe, though his preferred method of categorization is in terms of the "historical," "scientific," "detective," and "supernatural" subgenres. Detective fiction—featuring the quintessentially late-Victorian specialist hero—already flourished before the appearance of Sherlock Holmes but will be left out of the account here. The other three categories, however, are useful chiefly as illustrations of the tendency of all such typologies towards disintegration. Keating admits that at this time of initial separation, the identity of the subgenres still remained extremely malleable. Wells's romances alone, he says, "drew indiscriminately on elements of horror, supernatural, psychological, fantastic and adventure fiction."<sup>9</sup>

But the question arises: if the subgenres had not yet developed distinct identities, if the conventions were not yet worked out, in what sense could a text "draw" on them? Is not the flux rather in the very nature of Keating's generic categories? Can one even speak of the mixing or hybridization of genres in a particular work if the genres themselves had not yet been conclusively defined?

As the final section of this article shows, Keating's dating of the differentiation is several decades premature, and his categories are so flexible as to become, in places, entirely permeable. Even the popularity and long-established tradition of "historical" romance were not enough to guarantee its generic autonomy. Towards the end of the century, Keating concedes, it became increasingly indistinguishable from the imperial adventure novel—epitomized by boy's own fiction—and the "cloak-and-dagger" novels of the Anthony Hope type. Its propagation of the cult of manliness and patriotism—represented by Doyle's imperialist historical romances—underlined its ideological conformity, yet what Keating terms its philosophical branch, which included William Morris's socialist fables, tended to the other end of the political spectrum. Keating's "supernatural" is an even more protean entity. It blended into horror on the one hand and into children's fiction on the other; it subsumed ghost stories of the Henry James variety, inspired by the casework of the Society for Psychical Research, and nourished the fantasy and fairy tale strand of George MacDonald and J. M. Barrie, which exploded in the Edwardian period with Kipling, E. Nesbit, G. K. Chesterton, Walter de la Mare, and Lord Dunsany. As for the "scientific" romance, in Keating's hands this becomes a virtually boundless catchall category, including every fabular form concerned with political speculation and the extrapolation of social developments—from Wells's futurist prophecies to the invasion and spy novels that first appeared in this period. Animal fables, journeys into the past and doppelgänger novels supposedly had affinities with it, and utopian and dystopian fiction fell under its rubric.

Though Keating's terminology is period-specific—Charles Hinton did publish a series of "scientific romances" in the 1880s, and "historical romance" was a well-known category—the meanings with which he imbues it are not entirely warranted by contemporary usage. Something must be wrong if Morris's medievalist utopia *News from Nowhere* looks likely to be slotted under the "scientific" heading. Keating's partially failed taxonomical exercise is simply one more example of the fact that no marker planted in the shifting sands of genre can pretend

to any high degree of stability. Those unwilling to create categories so capacious as to be impracticable give in to the opposite compulsion to generate ever-new configurations, to keep multiplying and subdividing classes and types, heaping qualifier upon qualifier, until they arrive at the conclusion that every text is *sui generis* and genre theory is bunk. All schemes of definition are dismissed as too unstable and fragmenting, imperfect attempts at the systematization of the most recalcitrant and unpredictable raw data imaginable. This article will not attempt to construct a model that can deal adequately with change, development, and transformation without falling into the formalist trap, or to set up a system of differences of sufficient complexity to account for the evolution of even the most conventional of formula fiction strands. Often, the most effective course of action is to avoid model-building altogether. One way of doing this is to adopt the generic theory of the period under consideration, within which its authors consciously operated—to judge them by their own criteria. Another is to take a willfully anachronistic approach and bracket authors together according to their place in subsequent networks of influence: to adopt the stance, in other words, either of contemporaries, or of future generations.

### Contemporary Views

So let us look first at contemporary views: how was the "New Romance"—as George Saintsbury still called it in 1907—described in the last two decades of the nineteenth century?<sup>10</sup> Some said it was a tale of the marvellous and supernatural, of strange happenings in faraway times and places; others claimed it was a narrative of improbable events and coincidences peopled by psychologically unrealistic heroes and villains; many maintained that it was simply a book with an adventure-dominated plot and a minimum of discursiveness and didacticism. The hero of W. H. Hudson's *A Crystal Age* wonders at one point whether everything that is happening to him is true or "only a fantastic romance."<sup>11</sup> The prologue to Corelli's *A Romance of Two Worlds*, about the existence of the afterlife and the spiritual world, explicitly states that "in the present narration, which I have purposely called a 'romance,' I do not expect to be believed...."<sup>12</sup> So was romance merely a synonym for an impossible fable, a lie? Was it, as Richard Jefferies implied when he called *After London* "in no sense a novel, more like a romance," merely the novel's antithesis—a view current since at least the eighteenth century?<sup>13</sup>

The matter was, of course, more complicated. Eminent romancers like Scott were known to have influenced the leading realists of the century, not just in England but as far abroad as Russia, and Stevenson, Kipling, Wells, and George MacDonald themselves wrote realist fiction, though there was no unanimity about exactly where the one shaded off into the other. Realism, in any case, had as many different recognised meanings as romance: realism of presentation was one thing, the realisms of the novel of manners or of the *roman expérimental* were something else. *She*, Andrew Lang noted in an enthusiastic review of Rider Haggard's best seller, "is a legend, not a novel," a work of fantasy, "impossible and not to be done," and yet it has "a certain *vraisemblance*, which makes the most impossible adventures appear true." Augustus Moore, attacking *She* several months later, used virtually the same words to define romance as "the record of the impossible adventures of a man or a number of men, which the author clothes with a certain *vraisemblance*, and which, to the casual reader, not only appear perfectly possible, but even probable"; and William Watson deplored the constant alternation between the naturalistic and the fantastic in his own anti-Haggard tirade ominously entitled "The Fall of Fiction." One reviewer called *She* "a marvelously realistic tale of fantastic adventures,"<sup>14</sup> and no one would have thought this an oxymoron, since even letters to the *Athenaeum* from nit-picking readers of Haggard's works commented on "the atmosphere of reality thrown about the most extraordinary incidents." This did not merely refer to the novelistic trappings that had become *de rigueur* for most genres in the age of what Edmund Gosse called the "tyranny of the novel."<sup>15</sup> Representatives of the New Romance such as Doyle, Haggard, Stevenson, Kipling, Stoker, and Wells "utilised the latest advances in printing technologies, such as half-tone lithography, to incorporate photographs, drawings, diagrams, and maps as a complement to the authors' aim of imbuing their fantasies with an aura of scientific authenticity."<sup>16</sup> Scientific authenticity was something the "scientific" romance aimed at by definition, while a certain kind of formal realism was known to have been a distinctive feature of romance at least since the Middle Ages.<sup>17</sup> Even William Morris, notwithstanding his well-known contempt for the analysis and didacticism of the Victorian realist novel, endorsed the very different sort of realism found in the Icelandic Sagas, which he equated with "the simplest and purest form of epical narration."<sup>18</sup> A reviewer of *The House of the Wolfings* in the *Nineteenth Century* found the mythical elements of Morris's romance "blended so skilfully with historic and pictorial realism that the *vraisemblance* is almost perfect."<sup>19</sup>

Yet for all such subtleties of distinction, the classic realist novel was too good a foil to let go for definitional purposes. When in the early years of the twentieth century Saintsbury recalled the part Stevenson played in the "rejuvenescence of romance," he still harped on the alternative the romance provided to the domestic novel, on its role as "the appointed reviver of prose-fiction."<sup>20</sup> These were the characteristic terms in which the critical discussion about the New Romance was conducted from the 1880s until at least the 1910s. The American critic William Lyon Phelps, taking stock of "the advance of the English novel" up to 1916, failed to develop his cursory references to the advent of mass literacy and the sharp increase in the demand for and production of fiction; he focused instead on what was by then the well-entrenched distinction between the romance of incident and the novel of character.<sup>21</sup> When a modern study like Robert Fraser's mentions that early editions of Stevenson's work were divided into "romances" and "novels," it is referring to publishers' categories, to the books' status as commodities classified for more effective distribution.<sup>22</sup> Wells's early publishers similarly classified his works as "short stories," "novels" (which included his realist fiction like *Love and Mr. Lewisham*, *Kipps*, etc.), "sociological and socialist essays," and "romances"—the latter consisted of his science fiction and utopias.<sup>23</sup> But when Phelps brought up the romance/novel dichotomy, he was operating in a very different hermeneutical context, where the two terms represented ideal generic types and embodied opposing philosophies of literature. His speculations will bear a closer look, because they contain the essence of the discussion of the preceding decades.

Although, like a number of modern scholars,<sup>24</sup> Phelps begins with an allusion to Clara Reeve's 1785 founding text of genre criticism, *The Progress of Romance*, it is only to take issue with her definitions. Phelps had inherited the convention of classifying certain types of historical fiction—which did not exist in Reeve's day—as romance, so her limitation of the genre to the fantastic was no longer sufficient; "incident" had become a more appropriate catchall category. The definition of realism is also broadened accordingly—to include now not just pictures of the familiar and the everyday, but the analytical novel that first made its appearance in the nineteenth century. Boiling down the pronouncements of the previous generation, Phelps reduces the difference between realism and romance to a belief in the faithful reproduction of the commonplaceness of life, on the one hand, and a desire to be taken out of it to a more beautiful and refreshing world, on the other. Though

he admits that realism, in the end, makes a deeper, more lasting impression than the diverting escapism of romance (the latter is a dream, the former "accurately typical of millions"), Phelps does consider the dream important enough to devote an entire chapter to what he calls the "Romantic Revival." He dates its beginning to 1894, the year of the demise of the triple-decker in all standard accounts of publishing history, but makes no mention of this fact. Instead, he presents the student with an appropriately romantic tableau of English fiction being rescued from the "giant," realism, by the "knightly figure of Stevenson." Phelps notes the amazing sales of the new romances, which became "a matter of interest to critics who were watching the public taste," and describes the way their success spawned numerous imitations, stage adaptations, and a fleeting vogue for historical adventure, prompting those who followed the literary market to turn romance writers overnight. According to Phelps's cyclical model, the excesses of nineteenth-century realism—both its "afternoon tea"<sup>25</sup> and "garbage" varieties (i.e. the domestic and the naturalistic schools)—had led to a predictable turn of the tide. Stevenson, the "ardent advocate of the gospel of romance," broke the stranglehold of a foul naturalism and let in the "invigorating air of the ocean," thus inaugurating a "revolution in English fiction."<sup>26</sup> The echoes of the articles of the 1880s and 90s grow ever stronger, until finally Saintsbury and Gosse make their appearance in person, with long extracts from their essays of the time heralding the coming reaction against realism and the revival of romance.

The penultimate decade of the nineteenth century had indeed witnessed an explosion of theorizing about the nature of romance. Among modern critics, Kenneth Graham, Peter Keating, N. N. Feltes, Stephen Arata, and Christine Ferguson have all offered differently accented summaries of the phenomenon, condensing in just a few pages the essence of the generic propaganda of Saintsbury, Haggard, Stevenson, and Lang, which countered introspective, unmanly, and morbid realism with a healthy, action-oriented romance in the tradition of Scott and Dumas.<sup>27</sup> But for a firsthand account one must turn to the *Contemporary Review*, *Longman's Magazine*, the *Fortnightly Review*, the *Westminster Review*, the *Saturday Review*, the *Academy*, and *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*: just some of the periodicals that featured opinions, manifestos and rebuttals in this new Battle of the Books, which is how Lang, the "dictator of letters,"<sup>28</sup> characterised it in one of his own contributions to the fray entitled "Realism and Romance."<sup>29</sup>

Lang, for his part, appealed for tolerance and the recognition of works of merit among all literary kinds and called for a cessation of hostilities. With a genial gesture of "it takes all sorts" he proclaimed the right of every genre to exist and please those whose tastes were suited for it; he even dared to hope for a literature uniting adventure and character. But in the end he still declared his own allegiance to romance, which included, as Lang phrased it, "tales of swashing blows, of distressed maidens rescued, of 'murders grim and great,' of magicians and princesses, and wanderings in fairy lands forlorn."<sup>30</sup> Translated into modern terms this very nearly matches up with the thrillers, women's romances, murder mysteries, and fantasies—the subgenres of popular fiction—that recent theorists of romance like Frye, Jameson, and Richter consider to be the latest incarnations of the form.<sup>31</sup> The opposite of romance for Lang was the minute study of manners and character, the "realism" which the reviewers of his day usually subdivided into its French (Flaubert, Zola), Russian (Tolstoy, Dostoevsky) and American (James, Howells) varieties. Lang in fact offered a whole series of culturally revealing antinomies to elucidate the distinction between the two modes: barbaric and savage vs. civilised and cultured; boy's own vs. female; bright and merry vs. dark and miserable; idealistically focusing on the pleasant and uplifting in life vs. pessimistically dwelling on the worst aspects of humanity; engagingly plotted vs. boringly introspective; Dickens and Haggard vs. Dostoevsky and James.

Many of the same notes were sounded with unfailing frequency by other commentators on the issue, and Saintsbury was foremost among them. In an 1887 article in the *Fortnightly Review*, he made an unapologetic case for the superiority of the romance form to the analytic novel of manners and welcomed the coming age of romance illumined by the twin stars of Stevenson and Haggard. Dull, unclean, sterile, monotonous, and pessimistic, the novel of character had outlived itself and was finally giving place to that simplest and "earliest form of writing, to the pure romance of adventure." It would not be a passing phase, for its popularity was based not only on the appeal of an interesting story, but on the mode's roots in the constants of human nature. Manners and conventions changed and grew stale, but the primal passions were ever fresh—eternally the same everywhere: "The novel is of its nature transitory and is parasitic on the romance." English literature would not attain the best it was capable of until gifted writers abandoned the novel form and returned to romance.<sup>32</sup>



A month after the appearance of Saintsbury's article, an anonymous contribution to the *Westminster Review* trumpeting the merits of Hall Caine took the argument to a new extreme. Reiterating the distinction between enduring human nature and transient "manners," the author swept the field clean of the morbid and moping novels of introspection, all those dull dilations and "mental anatomisings" which made up for paucity of narrative and incident in superabundance of critical comment. In their stead he hailed the "romantic revival," at whose head came not Haggard with his supernatural impossibilities, but Caine: noble, pure and morally elevating. His was a "romance of reality," dealing with familiar things in an imaginative manner, and it was content to tell a story of passion and incident, leaving aside "lengthy disquisition and elaborate analysis." It showed, contrary to Zola, that it was "possible to be artistic without being immoral."<sup>33</sup> The lineaments of a definition were growing clear through constant repetition, though at times the range of reference was somewhat widened: "according to the ordinary acceptance of the word," wrote Saintsbury, "romance is taken to imply a story dealing more with adventure and with the tragic passions than with analytic character-drawing and observation of manners."<sup>34</sup> The tragic was usually rejected by the champions of romance, but for all intents and purposes this description, along with the authors who best embodied it (Scott, Dumas, and Stevenson), was adopted without reserve.

The most original explanation for the English predilection for romance, "or rather its modern form, the novel of adventure," was given by an anonymous contributor to the *Saturday Review*, who linked literary taste and production to national character: "The English is a colonizing race that seeks adventures and finds them in every quarter of the globe.... It is not to be wondered at that the race that most loves adventures and perils, and feels more keenly than others the fascination of the unknown, should prefer works of art that render its peculiar passion." The French excel at "the analysis of characters or passions playing within the frame of everyday life" because they are "neither adventurous nor romantic, but gifted with the Latin reasonableness and clearness of view." So even the clichés of Anglo-Saxonism were roped into the generic debate, though the author of the article unpatriotically concluded that realism would triumph.<sup>35</sup>

But best-selling writers of romance were not so sure, and made this known to the critics in their own contributions, defining the art that they practiced. One of Stevenson's instalments was in fact a reply to

James's (anthology-destined) "The Art of Fiction," in which he poured scorn on James's naive presumption that the novel could "compete with life" or offer a transcript of it, and emphasised instead its complete artificiality.<sup>36</sup> He singled out three types of novel for consideration: that of adventure, that of character, and the dramatic novel of passion, and though he did not argue the preeminence of the former like his less-reticent peers, he made it quite clear that issues such as virtuosity of style, moral seriousness, and depth of character were of no relevance to it. In an earlier declaration, "A Gossip on Romance," Stevenson had already homed in on circumstance, adventure, striking and memorable incident, story for the story's sake,<sup>37</sup> the pictorial quality of daydream, and the total absorption of the reader in the progress of the tale, as the main characteristics of his chosen form.<sup>38</sup>

Rider Haggard, always the anthropologist, traced the love of romance to the very origins of humanity and declared it to be innate to the barbarian and the cultured man alike, appealing across "class," "nation," and "age." Romance was the finest type of literature, the spring-well of the most lasting masterpieces, offering the beauty and perfection that people of the modern world, longing to be taken out of themselves and refreshed, truly needed. Haggard also differentiated between three schools: the emasculated and enervated American school; the filthy and brutal productions of French naturalism, corrupting to the social fabric; and the prudish, conventional, morally straight-laced, "namby-pamby" English novel. England had to develop a free and ideal art, with heroism as its proper subject, for if it did not do so, Zolaesque obscenity would engulf all. But meanwhile, it was best to soar with the writer of romance to the "calm retreats of pure imagination."<sup>39</sup>

These were some of "The New Watchwords of Fiction" that Hall Caine echoed in his own manifesto of 1890.<sup>40</sup> Picking up where Lang left off, but giving the latter's gentlemanly remonstrances an earnestly evangelistic turn, Caine exalted virtuous "ideal" over rotten and degenerate "fact" and preached the necessity of showing the highest that human nature was capable of, painting life as it should have been—wisely ordered according to the precepts of divine justice—rather than as it was. All art, in fact, had to be subservient to the idea of poetic justice; the purpose of the writer was to make the world better, to set up an ideal of heroism in an appropriately aloof setting, not to reproduce character or history photographically. Passion, imagination, and enthusiasm were to rule over the harmful cynicism of French realism, to which, abandoning Lang's good-natured inclusivity, Caine denied the very right to

exist. Exhorting against the evils of this ungodly mode, he prophesied an idealist millennium, when romance, the only valid literary genre, would finally triumph across Europe and America.

### The Childhood of the Race

The romancers' sense of their own importance was not shared by all contemporaries. Many perversely insisted on treating the romance as "juvenile literature, rather than as something culturally central."<sup>41</sup> Not only was it noted that penny dreadfuls were aimed primarily at young readers, but in the discussion of romance proper "juvenile" quickly became a familiar term of opprobrium. A very vocal school dismissed romance as wholly "repugnant to the spirit of the age" (this resided in realism) and only fit "for perusal by juvenile readers."<sup>42</sup> In a riposte entitled "The Decline of Romance," a real-life incarnation of Dickens's Gradgrind named D. F. Hannigan lambasted the juvenile puerility turned out by Rider Haggard and his ilk ("We want facts, not romantic dreams") and heralded, a mere seven years after Saintsbury's triumphant declaration of its revival, the demise of the romance mode. He aimed his stream of indignant adjectives at the childish "Haggardian romance [which] will ultimately take its proper place with the chronicles of *Bluebeard*, *Cinderella*, and *Jack the Giant Killer*" (leaving the mature grown-ups to their solemn appreciation of carefully researched Continental realism). Hannigan singled out for abuse the narrative characteristics of improbability, unnaturalness and fancifulness, which had long been leitmotifs of romance criticism.<sup>43</sup> Of course, he was no more foresighted in his predictions of the decline of romance than were the doom-mongers of realism like Hall Caine. The advertising pages of the magazines in which articles such as Hannigan's appeared continued to carry publishers' lists with announcements of ever more books entitled "X: A Romance," and despite realism's theoretical prominence in the reviews, the widespread antipathy to this "childish" yet annoyingly popular genre indicated that it was a foe to be reckoned with.

But to have accused a book of "childishness" in the late nineteenth century did not mean quite the same thing as it does today, though the epithet is being bandied about more than ever. The significance attached to this word by champions and detractors of romance alike went far beyond the province of literary criticism and into the reaches of evolutionary anthropology. For the romance, "dealing, as it did, with adventures and enchantments, with giants and dragons and dwarfs," appealing "only to childish credulity," must also have belonged "to the

infancy of art."<sup>44</sup> Evolutionary anthropology, from which most of the scientific support for the assumption of a connection between the child and the barbarian came, was a discipline that developed, along with comparative mythology and philology, in the mid- to late-nineteenth century. All these new fields of knowledge made use of the writings of the "infancy of letters" to create the Victorian image of primitive man. The Sagas, the *Nibelungenlied*, and Homer were the "oldest literary monuments" that preserved the last "surviving traces" of primitive social organisation.<sup>45</sup> They served as a quarry of primary material not only for romancers like Haggard keen to find interesting plots for his Greek and Icelandic tales, but also for the numerous scholars of language and anthropology (not to mention history, law, and politics) looking for examples to corroborate their theories of social and linguistic evolution. Romance was assumed to be native to the early stage of society: Saintsbury called it the earliest form of writing. A socialist utopian romance like Morris's *News from Nowhere*, with its talk about the second childhood of the world and the "childish" fairy tales on utopian walls, only made sense with reference to the common notion of the first childhood of the world, the "prehistoric, heroic, and precapitalist culture—that ha[d] produced the literature that both Morris and [his utopians] venerate."<sup>46</sup> E. B. Tylor's primitive survivals, preserved in the folklore of the European peasantry, were precisely the specimens of popular art that Morris tried to recreate in his romances and wished to resurrect in the socialist future.

The child and the illiterate peasant were but two incarnations, like savages or women, of one of the most entrenched concepts in the Victorian worldview: they were the first rungs of an evolutionary ladder justified by anthropology but adopted in many scientific, political, and literary spheres.<sup>47</sup> Drawing parallels between the childhood of an individual person and the "childhood of the human race" was a common practice throughout the Victorian period. Everyone from Friedrich Engels to T. H. Huxley, who spoke of "the heroic childhood of our race" in his famous "Evolution and Ethics" lecture, indulged in it.<sup>48</sup> The practice was particularly favoured by Teutonists—from Carlyle, with his child-like Norse hero living in the "early childhood of nations," to Charles Kingsley, who entitled the first of his Cambridge lectures on *The Roman and the Teuton* "The Forest Children."<sup>49</sup> Kingsley highlighted both the good and the bad children's qualities of "our Teutonic race" and developed the theme of its "boy-nature," its "youthful strength and vitality" for many pages, emphasising "this childishness of our forefathers. For



good or for evil they were great boys.... Races, like individuals, it has been often said, may have their childhood, their youth, their manhood, their old age, and natural death. It is but a theory—perhaps nothing more. But at least, our race had its childhood.” The lecture concluded by invoking the *Nibelungenlied* as an allegory of the Teutonic conquest of Rome. The Romans are Trolls, “man-devouring ogre[s],” the promise of their civilisation is vanishing fairy-gold, a “fatal Nibelungen hoard.” History becomes romance, “a myth, a saga, such as the men [of old] ... loved; and if it seem to any of you childish, bear in mind that what is childish need not therefore be shallow.”<sup>50</sup>

Examples may be multiplied. John Lubbock, a founding father of evolutionary anthropology, devoted some pages to the “similarity existing between savages and children” in *The Origin of Civilisation*.<sup>51</sup> Darwin, in *The Origin of Species* and *The Descent of Man*, referred approvingly to Ernst Haeckel, whose theory of recapitulation held that species’ evolution (phylogeny) and the biological evolution of an organism (ontogeny) were analogous. In other words, social development mirrored mental development (or vice versa). Max Müller’s degenerative sequence of genres—from mythology through folklore to nursery tales, associated respectively with savages, peasants, and civilised children—also relied on the model.<sup>52</sup> Lang, Müller’s opponent, stood the sequence on its head but still preserved the essential connection and continued to equate the tastes of children and those of “the young age of man,” “the tastes of their naked ancestors, thousands of years ago.”<sup>53</sup>

That romance had primeval origins but was also a juvenile genre was therefore no paradox. On the contrary, as Kingsley had written in his preface to a reworking of “Greek fairy tales” for his children: the Greeks “were but grown-up children.... while they were young and simple they loved fairy tales, as you do now. All nations do so when they are young: our old forefathers did, and called their stories ‘Sagas.’ I will read you some of them some day—some of the Eddas, and the *Völuspá*, and Beowulf, and the noble old Romances.”<sup>54</sup> Everyone knew that Stevenson wrote books for boys, but the dedicatory poem to *Treasure Island* made the link with ancestral literature explicit by characterizing this tale for “youngsters” as an “old romance, retold / Exactly in the ancient way.”<sup>55</sup> Lang and Haggard were also fond of associating barbarians and boys, and as a practitioner in both fields and a figure linking romance and anthropology, Lang makes an interesting case study. He was a renowned folklorist—both author and collector of many volumes of romances and fairy tales, and a founder of the Folk-

Lore Society—as well as an acknowledged authority on anthropology. His studies of myth and totemism played a prominent role in the ethnological and philological debates led by Tylor and Müller. He wrote a sequel to the *Odyssey* with Rider Haggard, who had himself read both Lang and Tylor’s *Primitive Culture* before setting out to write his first successful book for boys. Stevenson and Kipling had done the same, and in fact, most of the authors of the romance revival were familiar with contemporary anthropological writing and used its conclusions to define and defend their chosen genre—to establish its pedigree in the face of unbelievers.<sup>56</sup> It is indeed highly symptomatic of the intense interdisciplinarity of *fin-de-siècle* intellectual life that Lang, the man who “was more than any other critic responsible for the great surge of interest in romance in the 1880s and 1890s,” should also have been an anthropologist. As George Stocking claims, “Romance may have served Lang as a kind of sublimated anthropology,” and the same could be said for Morris with his stories of barbarian tribes.<sup>57</sup>

### Case Study: Fantastic Romance

These are just some of the dimensions of the contemporary perception of romance, but what about the “anachronistic” approach referred to in the introduction, which attempts to delimit the boundaries of a genre by looking at the fruits—the outcomes rather than the origins—of literary history, by scrutinizing with perfect hindsight vision the diachronic networks of influence arising in many cases after the authors’ deaths? Its usefulness may be demonstrated with a case study of the so-called “fantastic” romance, arguably the most important subgenre, but also the hardest to pin down. When we try to approach it formally, the category dissolves into ambiguity, for the “fantastic,” however defined, is usually just one ingredient in a heterogeneous stew. In Rider Haggard’s *Eric Brighteyes*, fantastic events, complete with witches and magic, are set in a “faithfully” reconstructed past, just as in Morris’s *The House of the Wolfings*—another Saga-inspired tale which featured foresight, a Valkyrie, and a magical hauberk, but was considered largely “historical” by contemporary commentators. As Haggard explains in his introduction, the presence of supernatural elements was as much a defining characteristic of the source material, orally transmitted by generations of skalds, as the truth of the central narrative. His “Norse romance” was both modeled on the Icelandic Sagas and cast “in the form of the romance of our own day” to make it more acceptable to modern readers—a mixture of *vraisemblance* and improbability familiar to reviewers of *She*.<sup>58</sup> *She*, of course, was not just a novel about

immortality, suffused with spiritualist rhetoric and grounded in serious archaeology, but an adventure tale which some have compared to the boys' fiction of G. A. Henty and Mayne Reid and to the imperialist romance of Kipling, Doyle, and Henley.<sup>59</sup> Its eponymous protagonist was a sorceress in the Fairy Queen mould, just like the beautiful villain of George MacDonald's *Lilith*—another book which escapes easy classification. *Lilith* reads in places like a children's fantasy, but it is also a philosophical Christian allegory with elements of horror, a biblical parable cum psychological and mystical nightmare, indebted to kabbalistic demonology, and imbued with the German romanticism of Novalis and the American romanticism of Poe and Thoreau. Why, then, despite all this diversity, does it still make sense to talk of fantastic romance as a separate entity and to bring together Haggard, Morris, and MacDonald as its representatives? Surely any similarity is as much a coincidence as the fact that in the final decades of the nineteenth century MacDonald and Morris successively occupied the same house in 26 Upper Mall, Hammersmith? The answer is that all three were part of a family of Victorian romancers who would *retrospectively* be acknowledged, by critics and disciples alike, as the pioneers of the modern "fantasy" genre. In the space that remains I would like to explore the implications of this approach.

Its most palpable advantage is that it refuses to be lured into a theoretical quagmire by the will-o'-the-wisp of the "fantastic" as such. That road is littered with the skeletons of generations of critics, who did not realise that to attempt to define fantastic romance, as to define romance itself, is to enter a bewildering maze from which there may be no way back. The secondary literature on the fantastic is vast, though it may be divided roughly into historical and theoretical schools—the former concerned with author case studies, the latter with the nature of the genre. To summarize the variety of approaches would be a herculean task, but a brief survey and a few observations are perhaps in order. There are interesting and insightful theoretical treatments, including Eric Rabkin's *The Fantastic in Literature*, Jack Zipes's numerous Marxist studies of fairy tales, and Darko Suvin's masterly *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. Rosemary Jackson's *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion* and Colin Manlove's *Modern Fantasy* are, on the contrary, deeply misguided and poorly researched diatribes.<sup>60</sup> For our purposes, however, theoretical studies of fantasy—whether structuralist, like Tzvetan Todorov's seminal work *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre*

and its successors,<sup>61</sup> or feminist, psychoanalytic or postmodern<sup>62</sup>—are of no more relevance than wide-ranging descriptive surveys,<sup>63</sup> whether they begin with Homer or with the Romantics. The fantastic as a mode did not originate in the late-Victorian period, nor is it limited to England, but when it becomes, like Frye's "romance," an archetypal entity to be uncovered in all times and cultures, the designation is emptied of substantive value. Similarly, the obliteration of boundaries involved in classing utopian, satiric, horror, science fiction, and nonsense writing under the umbrella of fantasy nullifies the usefulness of the term. Even period overviews of Victorian and Edwardian fantasy, with their standard litany of authors, are too broad to be helpful. Stephen Prickett's *Victorian Fantasy* charts a tradition beginning with the Gothic and Romanticism, ranging through Lear and Carroll, Kingsley and MacDonald, to end with the Edwardian children's fantasy of Kipling and E. Nesbit. Karen Michalson's *Victorian Fantasy Literature* also opens with the Romantics and hits all the standard highlights with Ruskin, MacDonald, Kingsley, Haggard, and Kipling.<sup>64</sup> While there is much that is valuable in such works, they all start out on the assumption that the authors under consideration form a coherent group.

But on what basis? For every theme, device, or personal acquaintance they have in common, they share twenty more with writers whom no one would think of placing in a study of Victorian fantasy. Critics attempt to create diachronic chains based not on historically demonstrable links, but on an appeal to some formal ideal, some quality of the "fantastic" definable philosophically and *a priori* rather than in terms of actual historical connection—whether through influence, association, or at least as occupying the same phase of print culture. It is the same problem that plagues studies of the romance genre as a whole: too few think of it, as Helen Cooper argues in *The English Romance in Time*, "as a lineage or a family of texts rather than as a series of incarnations or clones of a single Platonic Idea."<sup>65</sup>

The literary-historical retrospect, however, is a powerful tool. It immediately untwines the genealogical strands that present nothing more than a confused tangle to the eye of the contemporary, or, to use another metaphor, it can compass the fruition of tendencies that are still in an embryonic state in the period in question. A mere potentiality in 1890 is a generic reality sixty years later, and this is perhaps what Keating should have emphasised in his consideration of late-Victorian romance subgenres. With hindsight, it is easy to single out the texts that became the precursors of modern fantasy and to highlight

the forerunners of other popular species of fantastic literature which inherited the different aspects of the late-Victorian mode. Already internally variegated at the end of the nineteenth century, the romance underwent a further differentiation—a sort of hardening and branching off of its individual constituents—into the now familiar strands of formula fiction. The “marvellous” or “supernatural,” originally found in solution with a number of other elements, gave rise to several distinct lines of influence. A simplified schema would trace the Gothic of Stevenson and Stoker (in confluence with several other streams) as it issues in the publishing category of horror; Wells would figure as the father (if only Oedipally<sup>66</sup>) of the “scientifiction” of American pulp magazines of the 1920s and 30s; while Morris, Haggard, and MacDonald would be joined as the originators of modern fantasy, the ancestors of C. S. Lewis and J. R. R. Tolkien.<sup>67</sup>

Thus, by historical accident, the fictions of the three authors retroactively come to stand at the head of a separate chain of development. The debt is readily acknowledged by their literary disciples in essays, letters, and autobiography—Lewis is so prolific in this regard that to cite all of his references to MacDonald, Morris, and Haggard would take pages. And it is in large part thanks to Lewis’s and Tolkien’s continuing popularity that the romances of MacDonald and Morris have been reprinted in the last fifty years: partly as an attempt to cash in, partly in a search for the roots of the genre. In 2003, Inkling Books reprinted *The House of the Wolfings* and *The Roots of the Mountains* in a collection entitled *More to William Morris: Two Books that Inspired J. R. R. Tolkien*, and the volume called *On the Lines of Morris’ Romances*—a quote from one of Tolkien’s letters—by the same publisher incorporates *The Well at the World’s End* and *The Wood Beyond the World*. C. S. Lewis’s preface to his *George MacDonald: An Anthology* is routinely included in editions of MacDonald’s *Phantastes* and *Lilith*, and since the 1960s there have been a number of publishers’ fantasy series committed to reprinting the “early” works. The Ballantine Adult Fantasy Series directly inspired by Tolkien’s success and edited by Lin Carter from 1969–1974 is the most famous. It made available hard-to-find texts by Morris, MacDonald, Haggard, Chesterton, and Dunsany, among others. Recently, Del Rey launched a new imprint, “Impact,” consciously modelled on the Ballantine series, and published *Tales Before Tolkien: The Roots of Modern Fantasy*, which includes short stories and fairy tales by Morris, MacDonald, Haggard, Andrew Lang, and E. Nesbit, among others.<sup>68</sup> The names, as can be seen, are still the same as in the proper

academic studies of Victorian fantastic romance, but here the rationale for placing them together has nothing to do with genre theory and everything with the omniscient backward look.

There is no special or peculiar connection—outside the general one of being self-professed romancers—between Morris, MacDonald, and Haggard in their own chronological moment, not enough at any rate to bring them together convincingly. But such a connection was about to be forged by the literary and book history of the twentieth century when “fantasy”—in the entirely concrete sense of the modern publishing category—emerged as a fully independent growth. The parallels with the flowering of the commercial romance at the end of the nineteenth century (from the role of the market to the beginnings of differentiation by subgenre) are instructive. All three authors were harbingers of the new era, “originators” or “pioneers” of a fantasy tradition that would only be recognised as a separate entity after the publishing boom unwittingly precipitated by Lewis and Tolkien (who still thought of themselves as writing “romance”). Selected elements of Haggard’s, MacDonald’s, and Morris’s romances were destined to be fused by their successors into a single unified tradition, though when looked at in their proper context and in isolation from future developments it is rather their differences of style and purpose than their archetypal plot similarities that strike the eye. Considered synchronically, as two unrelated specimens of the late-Victorian romance scene, texts like *She* and *Lilith* may have little in common; in fact, individually they may bear more formal affinity to a Gothic romance of Bram Stoker’s than to each other. But viewed diachronically, in terms of their locations in the networks or sequences of descent, both are firmly conjoined as progenitors of fantasy, while *Dracula* stands apart as a seminal text in the tradition of horror literature. Such permutations are numerous, and there are more than two overlapping circles in the Venn diagrams of generic history. Wells and Morris, for example, while poles apart as regards the lineages of science fiction and fantasy (except in the case of Lewis), are twin links in the evolution of utopian writing. So it is only in its highly specific late-twentieth-century denotation that “fantasy” may be used to set apart the works of Morris, Haggard, and MacDonald from the myriads of other narratives with “fantastic” ingredients, and only those studies which consider them in this light are truly convincing.<sup>69</sup>

Nicholas Salmon’s introduction to *The Well at the World’s End* describes Morris as “the man who invented fantasy”—an egregiously unfounded claim if fantasy is understood to be any of those nebulous

things which begin with Homer, but a simple statement of fact if it is used in the sense most familiar to the average customer of Borders bookstore.<sup>70</sup> Among scholars of the Inklings the fact of this paternity has long been a commonplace. But though the realisation is not limited to fantasy specialists—the entry on “Romance” in *The Harper Handbook to Literature* (edited by Northrop Frye) also draws a line from Morris’s late prose romances to Tolkien<sup>71</sup>—they usually come at it from the opposite end. They engage, in other words, in old-fashioned *Quellenforschung*: working backwards and inductively from modern fantasy fiction, rather than randomly picking texts to fit some general law or axiom of what fantastic romance should be. This article started out by saying that it is impossible to define romance, and in fact, both of the approaches that it has explored—contemporary and anachronistic—are attempts to avoid theory building in favour of empirical investigation: arguably the most useful way of dealing with questions of genre.

## Notes

1. See the introduction to *A Companion to Romance: From Classical to Contemporary*, Corinne Saunders, ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004). It states directly that “the genre of romance is impossible adequately to define” (2).
2. Northrop Frye, *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976); Gillian Beer, *The Romance* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1970).
3. Derek Brewer, “The Nature of Romance,” *Poetica*, 9 (1978), 46, 40. See also his chapter “The Popular English Metrical Romances” in *A Companion to Romance* (45–64), which reiterates that the “country gentry” represented the typical readership, although courtly audiences also read lower-class vernacular romance.
4. *Ibid.*, 61.
5. For the frequent occurrence of the word “romance” in the titles of penny dreadfuls and utopias, see Elizabeth James and Helen R. Smith, *Penny Dreadfuls and Boys’ Adventures: The Barry Ono Collection of Victorian Popular Literature in the British Library* (London: The British Library, 1998); and Lyman Tower Sargent, *British and American Utopian Literature, 1516–1985: An Annotated, Chronological Bibliography* (London: Garland, 1988).
6. Romances, as Christine Ferguson points out in *Language, Science and Popular Fiction in the Victorian Fin-de-Siècle: The Brutal Tongue* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), were “the most popular literary form of the fin-de-siècle” and “the best-selling novels of the period” (54). See also Nicholas Daly, *Modernism, Romance and the Fin de Siècle: Popular Fiction and British Culture, 1880–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Romancers such as Stevenson, Haggard, Barrie, Doyle, Weyman, Du Maurier, Kipling, Corelli, Caine, Hope, Wells, and Watts-Dunton predominate on a variety of lists of late-Victorian best sellers: see Richard Altick, Appendix B: “Best-Sellers” in *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800–1900* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1957); “Nineteenth-Century English Best-Sellers: A Further List,” *Studies in Bibliography*, 22 (1969), 198–207; “Nineteenth-Century English Best-Sellers: A Third List,” *Studies in Bibliography*, 39 (1986), 235–41; Troy J. Bassett and Christina M. Walter, “Booksellers and Bestsellers: British Book Sales as Documented by *The Bookman*, 1891–1906,” *Book History*, 4.1 (2001), 205–36; and Part III of Philip Waller, *Writers, Readers, and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain 1870–1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). In free public libraries the most popular authors were mostly (though not exclusively) romancers: Corelli, Caine, Kipling, Doyle, and Wells, in descending order. For advertising,

- see N. N. Feltes, *Literary Capital and the Late Victorian Novel* (London: Wisconsin University Press, 1993), 114, 123–24; Waller, chapter eight “Product Advertising and Self-Advertising,” and chapter eighteen, “Market Conditions”; Mary Hammond, *Reading, Publishing, and the Formation of Literary Taste in England, 1880–1914* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), chapter four; Joseph McAleer, *Popular Reading and Publishing in Britain, 1914–1950* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 24–26; and Alexis Weedon, *Victorian Publishing: The Economics of Book Production for a Mass Market 1836–1916* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 161.
7. Peter Keating, *The Haunted Study: A Social History of the English Novel, 1875–1914* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1989), 44–55. See also Graham Law, *Serializing Fiction in the Victorian Press* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000), 182, for provincial and metropolitan newspaper fiction, syndication, and “the growing power of the metropolitan journals to encourage the trend from the general narrative modes of melodrama and sensation towards the specific popular genres of adventure, mystery, and romance.”
  8. Keating, 340–66.
  9. *Ibid.*, 358.
  10. George Saintsbury, *The Later Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1907), 127. Saintsbury was a prominent conservative man of letters and Professor of English Literature at Edinburgh.
  11. W. H. Hudson, *A Crystal Age, The Collected Works of W. H. Hudson* (1887; London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1922), II:37.
  12. Marie Corelli, *A Romance of Two Worlds* (London: Richard Bentley and Son, 1886), I:4.
  13. Edward Thomas, *Richard Jefferies* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1938), 232; repr. in Richard Jefferies, *After London, or Wild England* (1885; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), ix; and J. R. Ebbatson, “Visions of Wild England: William Morris and Richard Jefferies,” *The Journal of the William Morris Society*, 3.3 (Spring 1977), 16.
  14. Quoted in Michael Saler, “Clap If You Believe in Sherlock Holmes: Mass Culture and the Re-enchantment of Modernity, c. 1890–c. 1940,” *Historical Journal*, 43.6 (2003), 612.
  15. Andrew Lang, “She [15 January 1887],” *Academy*, 31 August 1912, 274–75; Augustus Moore, “Rider Haggard and ‘The New School of Romance,’” *Time*, May 1887, 513; William Watson, “The Fall of Fiction,” *Fortnightly Review*, September 1888, 324–36; John W. Evans, “Fact and Fiction,” *Athenaeum*, 31 July 1886, 144; Edmund Gosse, “The Tyranny of the Novel,” *National Review*, April 1892, 163–75.
  16. Saler, 612.
  17. As modern scholars from Derek Brewer to C. S. Lewis in *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), and Michael McKeon in *The Origins of the English Novel: 1600–1740* (London: Radius, 1987) have also recognised.
  18. *The Saga Library*, William Morris and Eiríkr Magnússon, eds. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1891), I:xii.
  19. William Morris: *The Critical Heritage*, Peter Faulkner, ed. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973), 330.
  20. George Saintsbury, *The English Novel* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1913), 294–96.
  21. William Lyon Phelps, *The Advance of the English Novel* (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1916), 16–17.
  22. Robert Fraser, *Victorian Quest Romance: Stevenson, Haggard, Kipling, and Conan Doyle* (Plymouth: Northcote House Publishers Ltd., 1998).
  23. See the front matter to H. G. Wells, *Socialism and the Family* (London: A. C. Fifield, 1906) and *New Worlds for Old* (London: Archibald Constable & Co. Ltd., 1908).
  24. See Beer and Miriam Allott, *Novelists on the Novel* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1959).
  25. Arthur Tilley referred to it as “the tea-pot style” in his “The New School of Fiction,” *National Review*, April 1883, 262; and Chesterton continued to talk of “tea-table novels” and “the romance of the teapot” in the twentieth century.
  26. Phelps, 24, 135, 137–38.

27. Kenneth Graham, *English Criticism of the Novel, 1865–1900* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965); Keating, 344–51; Feltes, 103–108; Ferguson, 54–57; Stephen Arata, *Fictions of Loss in the Victorian Fin de Siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 89–95.
28. G. S. Street, "Some Opinions," *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine*, November 1898, 595.
29. Andrew Lang, "Realism and Romance," *Contemporary Review*, July–December 1887, 683–93.
30. Ibid., 684–85.
31. See Frye, 43; Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Symbolic Act* (London: Methuen, 1981), 105, 107; David H. Richter, "The Gothic as Genetrix: Twentieth-Century Genre Fiction," *The Progress of Romance: Literary Historiography and the Gothic Novel* (Columbia: Ohio State University Press, 1996), 144ff.; Beer, 78–79; Daly, 118.
32. George Saintsbury, "The Present State of the Novel. I," *Fortnightly Review*, September 1887, 415–16.
33. "A New Novelist," *Westminster Review*, October 1887, 849, 843.
34. George Saintsbury, "New Novels," *Academy*, 19 March 1881, 204.
35. "Romanticism and Realism," *Saturday Review*, 8 December 1894, 615–16.
36. R. L. Stevenson, "A Humble Remonstrance," *Longman's Magazine*, November 1884, 139–47.
37. As Lang called it in "Realism and Romance," 689.
38. "Fiction is to the grown man what play is to the child" (R. L. Stevenson, "A Gossip on Romance," *Longman's Magazine*, November 1882, 77).
39. H. Rider Haggard, "About Fiction," *Contemporary Review*, January–June 1887, 177, 180.
40. Hall Caine, "The New Watchwords of Fiction," *Contemporary Review*, April 1890, 479–88.
41. Daly, however, is speaking of "modernist" twentieth century criticism (117). See also Harold Orel, *Popular Fiction in England, 1914–1918* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992), 41.
42. D. F. Hannigan, "The Decline of Romance," *Westminster Review*, January 1894, 35, 33.
43. Ibid., 35, 36.
44. "Romanticism and Realism," 615.
45. E. B. Bax, *The Religion of Socialism* (London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1886), 5.
46. Carole Silver, *The Romance of William Morris* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1982), 149–50.
47. Sally Shuttleworth, "Victorian Childhood," *Journal of Victorian Culture*, 9.1 (Spring 2004), 107–13.
48. Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State: In the Light of the Researches of Lewis H. Morgan*, Alec West, trans.; Eleanor Burke Leacock, rev. (1884; London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1972), 87; Thomas H. Huxley, *Evolution and Ethics and Other Essays* (London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1903), 86. J. W. Burrow in "The Uses of Philology in Victorian England," *Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain: Essays in Honour of George Kitson Clark*, Robert Robson, ed. (London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1967), 183, refers to the "genetic analogy," by which "the history of a people followed a sequence similar to that of the life of a man: childhood, manhood and old age."
49. Thomas Carlyle, *On Heroes, Hero-Worship and the Heroic in History* (1841; London: Chapman and Hall Limited: 1897), 27.
50. Charles Kingsley, *The Roman and the Teuton: A Series of Lectures Delivered before the University of Cambridge* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1864), 1, 8–9, 5–6, 15–16.
51. John Lubbock, *The Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1870), 402–403. He was also the author of the seminal anthropological text *Prehistoric Times, As Illustrated by Ancient Remains, and the Manners and Customs of Modern Savages* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1865), and President of the Working Men's College.
52. George Stocking Jr., *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology 1888–1951* (Madison: Wisconsin University Press, 1995), 52. See also J. R. R. Tolkien, "On Fairy-stories," *The Monsters and the Critics and Other Essays*, Christopher Tolkien, ed. (London: HarperCollins, 1997), 109–61.
53. *The Violet Fairy Book*, Andrew Lang, ed. (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1901), viii.

54. Charles Kingsley, *The Heroes; or, Greek Fairy Tales for My Children* (Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1856), xvi.
55. See Phelps, 137; R. L. Stevenson, *Treasure Island* (London: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1883), front matter.
56. See Julia Reid, *Robert Louis Stevenson, Science, and the Fin de Siècle* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan Ltd., 2006). Also see Ferguson, Arata, and Fraser.
57. Stocking, 52.
58. H. Rider Haggard, *Eric Brighteyes* (1891; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895), viii, x.
59. See Patrick Brantlinger's introduction to H. Rider Haggard, *She: A History of Adventure* (1887; London: Penguin Books, 2001), xxiii.
60. Eric Rabkin, *The Fantastic in Literature* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976); Darko Suvin, *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979); Rosemary Jackson, *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion* (New York: Methuen, 1981); Colin Manlove, *Modern Fantasy: Five Studies* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1975).
61. Tzvetan Todorov, *The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1975).
62. For example, Brian Attebery, Christine Brooke-Rose, Lance Olsen.
63. Colin Manlove, *The Fantasy Literature of England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999) and *Christian Fantasy: From 1200 to the Present* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992).
64. Stephen Prickett, *Victorian Fantasy* (Hassocks: The Harvester Press, 1979); Karen Michalson, *Victorian Fantasy Literature: Literary Battles with Church and Empire* (Lampeter: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1990). Her innovative treatment of *She* in terms of gender roles and anti-imperialism is part of a larger contention that Victorian fantasy from the latter part of the century was subversive of imperialism, just as that from the early part (including MacDonald) was subversive of organized Christianity.
65. Helen Cooper, *The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 8.
66. See R. D. Mullen, "From Anglo-American to Amero-British, Alas!" *Science Fiction Studies*, 20.2 (July 1993).
67. Although E. Nesbit was also a great influence on Lewis and is in some ways closer to Morris in her alternate guise as a late-Victorian socialist writer, her "fantasy" works fall outside of the selected time frame. Other early twentieth-century fantasists or romancists such as Lord Dunsany and E. R. Edisson are essentially parallel to, not part of, the line of descent in question.
68. *More to William Morris: Two Books that Inspired J. R. R. Tolkien* (Seattle: Inkling Books, 2003); *Tales Before Tolkien: The Roots of Modern Fantasy*, Douglas A. Anderson, ed. (New York: Del Rey, 2003).
69. Such as Richard Mathews, *Fantasy: The Liberation of Imagination* (London: Routledge, 2002). In a recent essay in *Modern Fiction Studies* Clyde Northrup, lamenting the neglect of Tolkien and Lewis-style "secondary world" fantasy by the Todorov school of criticism, referred to "the nineteenth-century pioneers of the genre—George MacDonald and William Morris." See Clyde B. Northrup, "The Qualities of a Tolkienian Fairy-Story," *Modern Fiction Studies*, 50.4 (Winter 2004), 815.
70. Nicholas Salmon, introduction to *The Well at the World's End*, by William Morris (Stroud: Alan Sutton Publishing Ltd., 1996), ix.
71. *The Harper Handbook to Literature*, Northrop Frye, et al., eds. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1985), 403. See also Brewer, 22–23; and Ken Goodwin's essay in *The Victorian Fantasists: Essays on Culture, Society and Belief in the Mythopoeic Fiction of the Victorian Age*, Kath Filmer, ed. (London: Macmillan, 1991). This essay collection bends generic boundaries more than usual by concentrating on Stoker, Wells, Richard Jefferies, and Morris's *News from Nowhere* alongside the more traditional focus on Morris's late romances, Kingsley, MacDonald, and Nesbit.